

79.37
A

The American Anti-Vivisection Society.

FORMERLY THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE RESTRICTION OF VIVISECTION.

SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT.

OFFICE, No. 1701 CHESTNUT STREET,
PHILADELPHIA.

1890.

179.4

AmJ

7

1889/90

OBITUARY.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD.

It is with deep and sincere regret that we announce the death of the Right Rev. John Fielder Mackarness, D.D., late Bishop of Oxford. The late Bishop had been a Vice-President of the Society from an early period of its history, and had at all times manifested the liveliest interest in its work and a readiness to help forward its objects.

In December, 1884, the Bishop, in the famous correspondence in *The Times*, on Brain Surgery, reiterated his most forcible argument against Vivisection in terms which are perhaps not too long to quote. He said :—

“My contention is that pity for the suffering, whether of
“men or other animals, is a part, and a very noble part, of
“human nature ; that to destroy it is to do mankind a greater
“injury than any which uncured disease can inflict. The
“principles on which the right to vivisection are defended are
“the same in substance with those of the slave market ; they
“have been urged in behalf of every cruel wrong which a
“more enlightened sympathy with weakness is slowly arous-
“ing the moral sense of mankind to condemn. * *
“The plea of the Inquisitor, false as I believe it to have
“been, was more forcible than that of the curious physiologist
“of Paris or Berlin. Let him at least be logical ; if a
“perfect knowledge of the secrets of the human frame is
“desired in the interest of mankind, let mankind be the
“victims. They only can yield results of undoubted re-
“levancy to the purpose of the inquiry. ‘Feeling,’ we are
“told, forbids the sacrifice. Are we to be held up to hatred
“and scorn because our ‘feeling’ has a wider range ?”

The Zoöphilist, October, 1889.

SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE
AMERICAN
ANTI-VIVISECTION SOCIETY,
FOR THE
YEAR ENDING JANUARY 24th, 1890.

Organized February 23d, 1883.

Incorporated May, 1883.

PHILADELPHIA:
1701 CHESTNUT STREET.
1890.

BOARD OF MANAGERS
OF THE
AMERICAN ANTI-VIVISECTION SOCIETY.

PRESIDENT.

WM. R. D. BLACKWOOD, M.D.,
246 N. Twentieth Street.

VICE-PRESIDENTS IN PENNSYLVANIA.

HIRAM CORSON, M.D.,
Conshohocken, Montgomery Co.

S. A. S. JESSUP, M.D.,
Kittanning, Armstrong Co.

GEORGE F. HORTON, M.D.,
Terrytown, Bradford Co.

CHARLES T. PALMER, M.D.,
Pottsville, Schuylkill Co.

JOHN A. BROOKE, M.D.,
Reading, Berks Co.

W. S. FOSTER, M.D.,
Pittsburgh.

A. D. JOHNSON, M.D.,
Allegheny City.

W. C. EVANS, M.D.,
Erie, Erie Co.

ISAAC MASSEY, M.D.,
West Chester, Chester Co.

VICE-PRESIDENTS IN PHILADELPHIA.

MR. HENRY FLANDERS,
REV. HENRY J. MORTON,
MRS. WAYNE MACVEAGH,
HON. DANIEL M. FOX,

MRS. JOHN K. VALENTINE,
MR. ALGERNON SIDNEY LOGAN,
MR. BENJAMIN COMEGYS,
JAMES E. GARRETSON, M.D.,

MATTHEW WOODS, M.D.

SECRETARY.

MISS ADELE BIDDLE,
2033 Pine Street.

TREASURER.

MR. STEPHEN FARRELLY,
Central News Company.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.

MRS. RICHARD P. WHITE,
2312 De Lancey Place.

* COUNSELLORS.

MR. RICHARD P. WHITE.

MR. CHARLES BIDDLE.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

MISS S. L. BALDWIN,
MISS MARTHA MILLIGAN,
MR. ROBERT R. CORSON,
MRS. ROBERT W. SMITH,
MR. ROBERT W. RYERSS,
MRS. JOHN EASBY,
MISS S. K. DAVIDSON,
MR. GEO. H. EARLE,
MISS CAROLINE BOGGS,

MRS. J. C. RANDALL,
MR. THOMAS EARLE WHITE,
MR. JOEL J. BAILY,
MRS. TRAVIS COCHRAN,
MRS. PHILIP S. CONNER,
MR. SAMUEL HINDS THOMAS,
MRS. CHARLES J. BIDDLE,
MRS. J. RENDELL HARRIS,
MISS AGNES YARNALL,

MRS. GEORGE S. LOVELL.

179.4

FRENCH AND ENGLISH VIVISECTION.

L'Encyclopédie Contemporaine, May 4th, 1890, contains the following passages which we translate textually, without comment or guarantee : —

“Conversing lately with Professor Chaumesse at his laboratory in the École de Médecine on the subject of the English Vivisection Act: ‘O,’ said he with a smile and a shrug of the shoulders, ‘that law is a puerile thing, and fetters so little our colleagues in England, that Horsley told me last year that they consumed as many animals as we do in their researches and demonstrations. He said that they used anæsthesia extremely little and as rarely as possible; but oftenest used curare in their surgical operations for the study of nervous reactions; the students being incapable of distinguishing the anæsthesia produced by chloroform from curarization of the animal silent and motionless under the scalpel.’

“‘Evidently,’ he added, ‘we should not allow a law like that to be enacted in France; not because it would fetter us, but simply because it would be an affront to our dignity — to our professional *amour propre*.’”

* * * * *

“Under the title *L'Amour des Bêtes*, Madame Séverine published in *Le Gaulois* of April 20th, 1890, under her *nom de plume* of Renée, a report revealing the atrocious vivisections performed on dogs by Drs. Quinquaud and Baumgarten, doctors at the Hospital of St. Louis. Let us quote the passage :— ‘At Saint Louis, Dr. Q. (Quinquaud) and his assistant B. (Baumgarten) inflict every day the most atrocious tortures on dogs. Sometimes they leave them to die of hunger; sometimes they immerse them in boiling oil or petroleum. . . . When these miserable creatures are taken out of the boiling liquid, they have no longer the appearance of animals, but of butcher’s meat alive. Their skin falls in rags, and their screams of agony are more frightful than can be imagined.’”

(The writer of the above from the *Gaulois*, Madame Séverine, is said by the *Encyclopédie* to be the wife of Professor Guébard, — a Vivisector.)

SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE
AMERICAN ANTI-VIVISECTION SOCIETY.

MADE ON JANUARY 24TH, 1890.

We have the honor to make the following report of the work of the American Anti-Vivisection Society, and of the progress of the Anti-Vivisection cause, during the past year, 1889.

As yet, this Society (now completing its seventh year of labor) stands alone as the only Anti-Vivisection Society in the United States. But all around our horizon there are appearing friends and allies whose interest and enthusiasm lead us to believe that, at the end of another year, we shall rejoice in other Associations like our own. Our English friends, too, have accomplished so much, that, when we survey all that has occurred, we see plainly an advance "all along the lines," even if there has been no signal victory.

In our own country a knowledge of the cruelty of vivisection has been spread, not only very widely in Pennsylvania, but it has been carried into twenty-eight different states and territories, by the zeal and labor of one member of our Association, who, being connected with the cause of Temperance, is enabled to do successfully a double work. A more detailed account of all that has been accomplished through Mrs. Lovell's efforts will accompany this report, and will be found full of encouragement to us all.

The plan which we formed at the beginning of the year, for lectures on the subject of vivisection, has been successfully

carried out. As many as twenty-one lectures have already been given in the churches or church lecture rooms of different denominations, and to large audiences, and they are to be continued through the winter. The pastors of these churches have come forward to give encouragement to our work, and to speak of its just claims to support and sympathy.

In these lectures there are first presented incidents and pictures of the fine traits and useful qualities of our dumb helpers and companions. Following these—in sharp contrast—come details of the cruelties which man inflicts upon these creatures, under the protection of, and in the name of science. The subjects included in the lecture are all illustrated by the stereopticon, and by the agreeable narrations first given, it is made less painful than if it treated solely of vivisection.

In thus bringing the cause of the animals into the domain of the Christian Church and enlisting the aid of its pastors, it is put in its true place—that of a great moral question, not one for the medical profession alone to discuss and settle. In England a number of the clergy of the English Church have recently united in forming the “Church Anti-Vivisection League,” for the total abolition of vivisection, with the Bishop of Bath and Wells for President. One of its rules says, “The action of the League in opposing Vivisection ‘shall rest solely upon moral and religious grounds; the basis of the League’s action being the conviction that ‘morality and religion have a right to impose and maintain ‘limits upon ‘Research and Experiment in the domain of ‘‘nature.’”

“Is it naught to the Bishops and clergy, or to the pious laymen who throng the Church Congresses (asks Miss Cobbe), that there are every year more and more men in England who are becoming possessed of this demon of scientific cruelty, and losing that which the human soul holds most precious, the power to sympathize and to pity?”

The subject of Vivisection was again discussed in the English House of Commons in the month of May last. It

was introduced by the Hon. Bernard Coleridge, on the ground that the Vivisection Act of 1876 was not being fairly carried into effect. "This," said Mr. Coleridge, "is because the "inspector* appointed under the act is not the right man "for the post, he being at heart a friend of vivisectors, when "he ought, if anything, to sympathize with the animals whom "he is placed there to guard."

"In 1887," continued Mr. Coleridge, "a round-robin was "signed by a number of persons who were interested in the "promotion of vivisection, and sent to the Royal College of "Surgeons, in reference to the bequest left by Sir Erasmus "Wilson for the advancement of science. The Royal College "of Surgeons was entrusted with the disposal of the money, "and the desire expressed in the round-robin was that the fund "should be devoted to the purpose of founding a national "physiological laboratory. One of the clauses of the round-robin urged that it was a national discredit to this country "that we do not possess laboratories such as Leipsic and Stras-burg and Bonn. I will give the House some indication of "the character of these laboratories. This is the sort of thing "which the Inspector under this Act, the man who is to "limit the operations and examine with anxious care, from "a humane standpoint, the reports of the Vivisectors, desires "to see repeated in this country. * * * From "Virchow's *Archiv*, Feb. 12th, 1880: at Leipsic, I find that "the spinal cords of two dogs were severed, and after some "weeks they were scalded. The animals survived the scald-ing for six to ten days, and then, after a continual fall of "temperature, died from putrefaction. Three other dogs, "whose spinal cords had been cut through, survived the scald-ing—three days, one week and three weeks respectively. "A large sheep dog succumbed 36 hours after having its "hinder quarters immersed three times in scalding water."

"*Experiment 31.*—A dog burnt for 30 seconds in boiling "water. On the next day morose, very dejected, no appe-

* Mr. John Eric Erichsen.

"tite. Died 44 hours after the burning. Then we have
 " 'a young, active dog' subjected to the transfusion of blood
 " of a scalded dog. Four days afterwards it was much
 " exhausted and staggered on its feet, perhaps from hunger,
 " and was killed. Violent scalding of a dog. It died after
 " eight hours." These are only instances of numberless cases
 " of the same character. We say," continued Mr. Coleridge,
 " that any man who says it is a national discredit that England
 " does not possess laboratories similar to those at Strasburg
 " and Leipsic, is absolutely unfitted to be an inspector under
 " an act the object of which is to prevent cruelty to animals."

Another member of the House, Mr. R. T. Reid, of Dumfries, said: "The fact is that, in my opinion, the administration of this Act has been little better than a sham, and that there is very little inspection at all."

He hoped that the discussion in the House would lead to a better enforcement of the law.

In regard to the round-robin which was presented to the College of Surgeons, to which Mr. Bernard Coleridge alluded, the answer from the College was not favorable to the petitioners. "The Museum Committee recommended that in reply to applications for permission to make use of the College work-rooms, the applicants be informed that the Council are not in a position to permit any investigations which involve experiments on living animals, nor the retention of living animals on the College premises, nor can they defray any expenses incurred in connection with such experiments made elsewhere." —*British Medical Journal*, December, 1888.

The importance of this decision is pointed out in the Report of the Victoria Street Society, as showing that in the opinion of the Council of the Royal College of Surgeons experiments on living animals are not a necessary adjunct to the education of medical men.

An effort having been made in London in July last, under the patronage of the Lord Mayor, to establish a Pasteur Institute in England, the discussion of the whole question of Pasteur's system was brought into the newspapers.

It has been thought hitherto by many persons that the strongest argument against the anti-vivisection movement lay in the success of Pasteur in preventing or curing hydrophobia—a success gained through experiments on animals. After such a benefit gained for the whole world, objections against using animals (it has been urged) should not be listened to. But these reproaches against the advocates of the cause of the animals have lost their power, since in France as well as in other countries, a fatal objection to the system has come to light: in a letter from a physician of New York to the Secretary of this Society, are the following lines, dated New York, April 19th, 1889:—

“Do you happen to know that the awful experiments of Pasteur, some four or five years ago, in producing rabies upon dogs, rabbits, and other animals, are now conceded to be of most doubtful utility? In a late number of the *Scientific American* of this city appears a report of a clinical lecture, delivered before the Veterinary Department of the University of Pennsylvania, by Dr. R. S. Huidekoper, which closes with this astounding statement: ‘A large number of persons who have submitted to these inoculations (of Prof. Pasteur) have died of hydrophobia, and, with our present knowledge of the mode of propaganda of the poison, it is certainly a question whether or not the disease has not been communicated by the inoculations which have been made for purposes of protection!’”

Other medical men have expressed the same opinion. Dr. Charles Bell Taylor, in the London *Spectator*, 13th of July, 1889, wrote, after mentioning cases of Pasteur’s patients who had died of hydrophobia, though bitten by a *healthy* dog: “Now, Sir, we must admit, in face of these facts, either that the bite of a healthy dog will cause hydrophobia, in which case there is no specific disease as rabies, or that M. Pasteur’s injections have proved fatal. In the opinion of many of M. Pasteur’s eminent countrymen (Professor Peter, Dr. Lutaud, the late Dr. Constantin James, Prof. Colin, and others) the latter solution is the correct

"one. They say, M. Pasteur *ne querit pas la rage: il la donne* (he does not cure hydrophobia, he gives it)." *

On another point a French physician has spoken. When M. Pasteur, writing to the Lord Mayor, said, "Certain credulous souls—by I know not what tales—imagine that our laboratories are chambers of torture," etc., etc., a letter appeared in the *Pall Mall Gazette* of August 5th, 1889, from Dr. F. Borel, in which he says: "Sir, will you permit a vivisection, past and present, and future, if it were necessary for the good of science and mankind, to tell those good people who believe seriously that the animals experimented on by M. Pasteur do not suffer, that they are deceiving themselves. My personal experience of fifteen years' practice gives me the right formally to deny the truth of that. . . . Any one who is accustomed to a laboratory, to physiology, or to pathological experiments, knows that animals suffer, when vivisected, greatly until death comes to deliver them. No! It is necessary for M. Pasteur to have living animals to support his theses. This letter is not the place to inquire whether he is right or wrong; but that I maintain, I, pathologist, and lately chief of an hospital, that he has imposed upon brave men, whose confidence he has won, when he pretends that these animals do not suffer."

Another subject of interest belonging to this year is the project of founding "The Shaftesbury Hospital" in London. With this institution no medical man who holds a license for vivisection or who upholds the practice is to be in any way connected. The primary object of the hospital is to be the immediate relief and cure of the patients, "the advancement of medical knowledge being entirely subordinate thereto." £2500, for the hospital, has been paid or promised.

We are glad to be able to record that when, in the month of July, an application was made to Mayor Grant, of the City of New York, by the Surgeon in command of the U. S. Marine Hospital for a permit for a medical man to obtain

* Sometimes called "*rage de laboratoire*."



FOR THE PROTECTION OF ANIMALS FROM VIVISECTION.

AN INDEPENDENT OPINION ON VIVISECTION.

By W. S. LILLY, Esq., Barrister-at-law.

(Extract from "The New Naturalism," *Fortnightly Review*,
August, 1885.)

"The attempt to determine ethical and jurisprudential problems by means of physiological fiction seems entitled to precisely the same amount of respect as the attempt to discover the secrets of physical life by torturing animals in a physiological laboratory. The theory of the vivisectionist, succinctly stated, amounts to this, that by the observation of symptoms, artificially produced in sound animal organisms, we may arrive at a knowledge of the causes of natural symptoms in unsound human organisms; for example, that by studying the phenomena of death by heat in a rabbit baked alive, we may understand the mechanism of febrile disturbances in a man. This theory obviously rests upon the confusion of two entirely different sciences, physiology, the science of healthy life, and pathology, the science of unhealthy states—a confusion which, in the words of the late Professor Bufalini 'has caused both science in general, and medicine in particular, the greatest evils, for it has blotted out the indirect treatment of disease and has extinguished the best method of diagnosis, substituting for it one which is perfectly arbitrary and

conjectural.' It is difficult to conceive of anything more senseless and unscientific than an attempt to interpret morbid states and morbid phenomena by physiological theories, to develop the laws of nature by mutilating the structure of conscient organic beings—every one of them an integral system of most complicated nervous network—to illustrate the modifications which spring up in a disease by processes which are foreign to natural influences. I say nothing of the confusion which also arises from the perfect dissimilarity between the functions and diseases of man and of the lower animals. But, indeed, the history of medicine is largely a history of human folly. Its so-called science in every age has consisted to a lamentable extent of mere aberrations from common sense. We live in an era of vivisection. And the voice of reason is as ineffectual against that ghastly shibboleth as it was against the vomiting of the emetic era, the evacuation of the purging era, the depletion of the bleeding era, the poisoning of the mercurial era and of the iodide of potassium era. Certain it is that the whole race of vivisectors, from the first until now, have not discovered one single agent for the cure of any malady, nor established any therapeutic fact or theory helpful in the smallest degree for the treatment of disease, nor contributed at all to the advance of scientific surgery. Certain it is that some of the most ferocious vivisections upon record—those, for example, of Dr. Bennett and Dr. Rutherford on the biliary secretion of the dog—have issued in mere fallacy and absurdity. Certain it is, as has been pointed out with great plainness of speech by Professor Koch, that the vast series of experiments in splenic fever performed by M. Pasteur have yielded results which are worse than valueless, so insufficient and so evanescent is the immunity against natural infection conferred by his preventive inoculation, and so grave are the dangers which it develops for man and other non-inoculated animals. And there is not the slightest reason for believing that the new vaccine of rabies, prepared in the laboratory of the same *savant*, by similar processes, will be one whit more efficacious. Nor let it be said that it is arrogant for a layman like myself to express so confident an opinion upon a matter lying within the domain of medicine and surgery. Here the question is of no esoteric mystery. It is purely of fact. And any mind trained to weigh and appreciate evidence according to the admirable rules fol-

lowed in our courts of law is in a far better position to judge of it than a mind destitute of that discipline, warped by professional prejudices and fettered by medical etiquette. A practitioner who refuses the vivisection shibboleth is in great danger of being put out of the synagogue. And although, as I know well, there are many of his brethren who share the convictions of Mr. Lawson Tait, there are few who have shown the courage displayed by that eminent surgeon when three years ago he read before the Birmingham Philosophical Society his masterly paper—it may be perused in the third volume of the Society's *Transactions*—wherein, going through the specific claims made for vivisectional experiments as a means for the advancement of medical science, he demonstrated their hollowness and untenableness. The similar claims made by M. Zola for his experimental method in literature are just as empty; the results obtainable by his researches in the latrine and brothel are of precisely the same value as those which the vivisector derives from the torture trough. 'The problem,' M. Zola tells us, 'is to know what a certain passion, acting in a certain environment, and in certain circumstances, will produce as regards the individual and society. And the way to solve it is to take the facts in nature, then to study their mechanism by bringing to bear upon them the modifications of circumstances and environments. Just as M. Claude Bernard transferred the experimental method from chemistry to medicine, so I transfer it from medicine to the drama and the novel.' Quite so. And, we may add, as the vivisector confounds two distinct sciences, physiology and pathology, so does M. Zola confound two sciences as distinct, physiology and ethics. And as the vivisector, in the study of phenomena arbitrarily produced in certain organisms, seeks the explanation of natural phenomena in very different organisms, due to quite other causes, so does M. Zola take his types from one variety of the human species, place them in certain arbitrary conditions, mutilate them at his pleasure, and then pretend to draw from them conclusions as to the action of the passions in the lives of men. True it is that the experimental medicine of M. Paul Bert and the experimental morality of M. Zola are analogous. And true it is that they are both as false in theory, and as worthless and worse in results, as they are vile and debasing in practice. '*Trahit sua quemque voluptas.*' Remonstrances

are wasted upon the artist in filth or upon the artist in torture. Nor is it by any means the first time in the world's history that obscenity and cruelty—the natural, the inevitable results of Materialism—have sought to conceal their foul and hideous lineaments under the mask of science.”

Published by the VICTORIA STREET SOCIETY FOR THE PROTECTION
OF ANIMALS FROM VIVISECTION, UNITED WITH THE INTERNATIONAL
ASSOCIATION FOR THE TOTAL SUPPRESSION OF VIVISECTION,
1, VICTORIA STREET, S.W.

dogs from the City Pound for scientific purposes, the Mayor denied the application. He had written first to the President of the Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in New York for his views on the subject. In his answer the President, after quoting portions of different laws, thus concluded : "I, therefore, in the name of our moral civilization, the progress of which during the past century your Honor has invited the citizens of this great Commonwealth to celebrate, and in the name of the Society I have the honor to represent, respectfully protest against the delivering up to the petitioner of the Marine Hospital, for torture, the dogs captured under the city ordinance, and ask that your Honor will promptly deny the request.

"JOHN P. HAINES, *President.*

"To his Honor, HUGH J. GRANT,

"Mayor of the City of New York."

The last London *Zoöphilist* tells us of an occurrence at Turin that should be recorded.

A Vice-President of the Turin Society for the "Protection of Animals," Signor Ruggieri, having made a public address in praise of vivisection, which was printed in the Report of the Society, the Countess Biandrate Morrelli, a member of the Turin Society (and the honorary correspondent of the Victoria St. Society), at a subsequent meeting of the Society, declared that from that moment she severed all connection with an association in which the making an apology for vivisection was permitted, and she reproached Signor Ruggieri with his speech. Her husband also at the same time withdrew from all connection with the Society. The central executive committee of the Victoria Society sent to the Count and Countess Morrelli the expression of its hearty approval of the course they had taken in order to vindicate their consistency as anti-vivisectionists and to signalize the claims of the animals tortured in scientific laboratories, as well as those used elsewhere, to the championship of all true humanitarians."

We have received from Dr. Leffingwell a book containing his two valuable essays on vivisection, one originally published in Scribner's Magazine, and one in Lippincott's. His generous donation of many copies we are distributing to all the students of medicine in this city.

One of the most important aids to our progress in this country has come in the pamphlet, "Vivisection in America," by Miss Cobbe and Benj. Bryan, Esq.; it is likely to exert a great influence in the formation of public opinion here on this subject. Another pamphlet of great value is that of Benj. Bryan, called "Hydrophobia and Vivisection." Indeed, we are continually under great obligations to our friends in England, especially to the Victoria St. Society, obligations which we can never adequately repay. Without the monthly paper, the *Zoöphilist*, we would be left in ignorance of most important events which are occurring, and important opinions which are being brought out in favor of our side every day.

Two distinguished advocates of the cause of the animals against the persecutions of science, have died during the year, namely, the Bishop of Oxford and Robert Browning; of the former we still have his forcible address, to speak of his strong condemnation of vivisection; of the latter we have a letter addressed to Miss Cobbe, in which he says:—"You have heard, I take an equal interest with yourself in the effort to suppress vivisection. I dare not so honor my mere wishes and prayers as to put them for a moment beside your acts; but this I know, I would rather submit to the worst of the deaths, so far as pain goes, than have a single dog or cat tortured on the pretence of sparing me a twinge or two. Ever truly and gratefully yours, Robert Browning."

The claims that our opponents make for vivisection are constantly contradicted by men whose position in the medical world give their words too much weight to allow them to be set aside. If we could only induce the members of the profession who stand as yet uncommitted to vivisection, to thoroughly examine it, there would be, we believe, a revolu-

tion in their opinions and feelings in regard to it. For this we shall labor. But the principle upon which we found our opposition is, that the cruelties of vivisection are morally wrong, and therefore, that whatever may be its gains, we have no right to practice it. This seems self-evident, but human selfishness obscures the vision, and justifies anything, if it is for its own advantage.

ADELE BIDDLE, *Secretary.*

REPORT OF THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.

The Corresponding Secretary reports that during the past year she has written a number of letters to physicians and others, requesting them to read Anti-Vivisection publications which she has at the same time, or soon afterward, forwarded to them. She has also made a *viva voce* request to many to read something on the subject, and has taken care to afford to all to whom she has spoken the means of doing so. She has had a long correspondence with Miss Frances Power Cobbe, principally on the subject of the new pamphlet written by Miss Cobbe and Mr. Bryan, entitled "Vivisection in America," of which publication Miss Cobbe has kindly presented to this Society two hundred copies. Miss Cobbe has sent also a large number of copies to different magazines and newspapers in the United States, and is much disappointed that she has not received more letters of acknowledgment. Two, however, that she has received are from John G. Whittier, the well-known poet, and Phillips Brooks, the distinguished divine, and are of a most gratifying nature. Mr. Whittier writes as follows:—

OAK KNOLE, DANVERS, MASS.,

11th month, 15th, 1889.

FRANCES POWER COBBE:—

My Dear Friend.—I am honored by thy welcome letter. Thy name and work are familiar to me, and thy "Intuitive Morals" I keep constantly by me:

I appreciate thy noble work for the dumb victims of vivi-

section. I am a member of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. I wish I had health and strength to circulate thy unanswerable argument, the "Controversy in a Nut Shell." I shall send a copy of it to "Our Dumb Animals" paper. Excuse the brevity of this note, my eyes fail me and writing is difficult.

Thanking thee for thy kind words, and with a hearty "God speed," I am very truly, thy aged friend,

JOHN G. WHITTIER.

The other, from Mr. Brooks, is as follows :—

233 CLARENDON STREET, BOSTON.

November 22d, 1889.

My Dear Miss Cobbe.—I thank you for your letter and for the pamphlet which you sent me with it. Both have interested me very much indeed.

That the common heart and common conscience must some day bear such overwhelming testimony and protest against reckless cruelty in scientific investigation and experiment, is beyond all doubt.

Already such protest has been, and is, making itself heard. What you have said has made the thoughtless think. Such revelations as this pamphlet makes are not without effect. For even scientists are men ! And behind the scientists there is Humanity.

With thankfulness for all that you have done in this and many ways, I am, yours most sincerely,

PHILLIPS BROOKS.

The Corresponding Secretary has been engaged also in a correspondence with a physician in this city occupying a position of importance in connection with one of our colleges. This correspondence, which began about another matter, drifted into one upon the subject of vivisection, and views and sentiments so gratifying were expressed by this doctor, that the Corresponding Secretary feels justified in making some extracts from his letters.

At one time he says: "I have done considerable vivisection myself, and admit that much of it was useless, in that it could have been dispensed with without loss to anybody, except the boys who were paid for the animals. Vivisection might possibly even do harm, by leading to erroneous conclusions, which, when applied to man, could do damage."

At another time he says: "Having been a practical vivisectioner myself for some years, my judgment in the matter must be fair to the cause of vivisection, but even at that I long ago was satisfied that vivisection did but little good, and now I have an honest doubt as to whether it has done any good at all."

These are very frank, straightforward confessions, and are particularly valuable as coming from a physician, and one so well qualified to speak upon the subject.

The Corresponding Secretary reports that in October, *Harper's Magazine* for that month was sent to her by Dr. Keen, with an article marked, which was written by himself, on the "Recent Progress of Surgery," in which a considerable portion of that progress was attributed to experiments upon animals.

Believing this to be entirely erroneous, your Corresponding Secretary ventured to write an answer to Dr. Keen's article, which has been accepted by the *New York Forum*, and which will probably appear before long in the pages of that excellent review. She understands that another answer has been written by Dr. Berdoe, of the Victoria Street Society, and sent to the *Century* with the request that it be published by the Company.

A letter was received from Miss Margaret Fortescue Rochester, Secretary of the "Buffalo Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals," saying that a prominent literary club of that city proposed to hold a discussion on the subject of "Vivisection," and asking the Corresponding Secretary to forward to her some of the most important publications in the possession of the Society.

This was done and the publications were received, but, owing to a death in Miss Rochester's family, which occurred soon after, she has not been able to give us any account of the result of the discussion.

A number of publications have been forwarded from the Victoria Street Society, in England, which the Corresponding Secretary wishes gratefully to acknowledge. Among them are the pamphlets entitled: "Formation of a Church Anti-Vivisection League," "Miss Cobbe's Appeal to the Society of Friends," "Do we Exaggerate," and "Harvard University and Vivisection."

In conclusion, the Corresponding Secretary, before closing her Report, would like to draw attention to the fact that the experiment which was performed last winter of removing an eye from a rabbit and placing a portion of that organ in the eye of a woman who was partially blind, in the hope of enabling her to see, and which experiment was extensively noticed by the press, and lauded as a triumph of vivisection, has proved a total failure. Not only did it not improve the sight of the patient, but she has since become much worse. The same newspapers which gave such prominence to the account of the operation took care not to mention how disastrously it had resulted, and that instead of proving the beneficial effects of vivisection, it was another instance of what erroneous and misleading inferences those who practice it are likely to draw from their experiments upon animals.

This is another example of the injustice and want of fairness with which we are obliged constantly to contend.

Respectfully submitted by

CAROLINE EARLE WHITE,
Corresponding Secretary.

ANNUAL REPORT OF TREASURER.

Dr.		Cr.
Balance on hand, February 1st, 1889.....	\$ 786 98	
Received for dues.....	\$251 00	
“ donations and subscriptions... 500 00		
Mrs. Wm. G. Thomas.....	\$100 00	
Miss Mary D. Fox.....	50 00	
Miss Emily Hinds.....	50 00	
Mrs. A. L. Lowry.....	70 00	
Miss S. K. Davidson.....	30 00	
Mr. Chas. Ferguson.....	30 00	
Miss Rebecca White.....	25 00	
Miss Rendall.....	25 00	
“ Mr. R. W. Ryerss.....	25 00	
Mr. C. L. Doll.....	25 00	
Mrs. Owen J. Wister.....	20 00	
Mrs. Jas. C. Smith.....	10 00	
Miss Emily H. Thomas.....	10 00	
Miss Frances Ferguson.....	10 00	
Mr. Wm. Cruger Pell.....	10 00	
Mrs. Wm. Cruger Pell.....	10 00	
	<u>\$500 00</u>	
$\frac{1}{2}$ proceeds of two dramatic entertainments 157 00		
Subscriptions to <i>Zoöphilist</i>	1 72	
Total receipts.....	909 72	
		<u>\$1696 70</u>
For postage and wrappers.....		\$ 68 72
Advertising.....		8 05
Rent and office expenses, including clerk hire.....		258 15
Printing.....		202 50
Lectures.....		209 42
Statement on vivisectional experiments.....		15 00
Sciopticon and pictures for lecturer.....		71 95
Subscription to <i>Zoöphilist</i> and pamphlets from Victoria St. Society.....		33 10
Miscellaneous.....		7 50
		<u>874 39</u>
Balance on hand.....		<u>\$822 31</u>

Examined and found correct,
 CAROLINE A. BOGGS,
 SAMUEL HINDS THOMAS,
Auditors.

FOR 1890.

LIST OF THE MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY.

HONORARY MEMBERS.

ARCHBISHOP RYAN, D. D. REV. SAMUEL E. APPLETON, D. D.
REV. I. L. NICHOLSON, D. D.

LIFE MEMBERSHIP, \$50.00

LIFE MEMBERS.

*Mrs. J. Rhea Barton.
Mrs. Clarence H. Clark.
Mr. Charles Motley Clark.
Miss Mary D. Fox.
Miss Hinds.

*Hon. Wm. A. Porter.
Mr. R. W. Ryerss.
*Mrs. Joseph W. Ryerss.
Mrs. W. G. Thomas.
Miss Anne Waln.

Mr. and Mrs. Joel J. Baily..\$ 4 00	Mr. Geo. H. Earle.....\$ 2 00
Mrs. Thos. W. Baily..... 2 00	Mrs. John H. Easby..... 2 00
Miss S. L. Baldwin..... 2 00	Mr. May S. Easby..... 2 00
Miss Emma J. Bartol..... 5 00	Miss Ewing, Newtown..... 5 00
Mrs. Richard Biddle..... 2 00	
Mrs. Charles J. Biddle..... 2 00	Mr. Stephen Farrelly..... 5 00
Mr. Charles Biddle..... 2 00	Mr. Charles Ferguson..... 30 00
Miss Adele Biddle..... 2 00	Miss Frances Ferguson..... 15 00
Mrs. David Birney..... 2 00	Mr. Henry Flanders..... 2 00
Mrs. M. L. Bisbing..... 2 00	Mrs. George Freeman..... 5 00
Miss A. C. Bisbing..... 2 00	Mr. Harry B. French.. 2 00
Mr. George Blight..... 2 00	Miss Mary D. Fox..... 50 00
Miss Boggs..... 2 00	
Mrs. Bowie..... 2 00	Miss Anna Griffith..... 2 00
Mrs. Wm. H. Bradley..... 2 00	
Mrs. Mary W. W. Brown... 2 00	Mrs. Wm. Helme..... 5 00
Mrs. Conyers Button. 2 00	Miss Hernerson..... 1 00
	Miss Emily Hinds..... 50 00
Mrs. Chas. Clingan..... 2 00	
Mrs. E. H. Champlin, N. Y. 10 00	The Misses Kendall, N. Y... 15 00
Mr. B. B. Comegys..... 2 00	Mrs. F. J. Kimball..... 2 00
Mr. and Mrs. Philip S. P. Conner..... 4 00	Miss Annie C. Knight..... 5 00
Miss Conner..... 2 00	
Miss Croxall..... 5 00	Mrs. J. K. Lee..... 2 00
	Mr. and Mrs. A. Sydney Logan..... 4 00
Miss S. K. Davidson..... 35 00	Mrs. George S. Lovell..... 2 00
Mr. C. L. Doll, Alabama... 27 00	

Mrs. Wm. Lowber.....	\$ 4 00	Mrs. Geo. H. Stroud.....	\$ 2 00
Mrs. A. L. Lowry.....	75 00	Miss Stroud.....	2 00
Mrs. Wayne MacVeagh.....	2 00	Mrs. Wm. G. Thomas.....	100 00
Mr. and Mrs. James Martin,	5 00	Mr. and Mrs. S. Hinds	
Mrs. Fred. T. Mason.....	4 00	Thomas.....	10 00
Miss M. E. Milligan.....	2 00	Miss Emily Hinds Thomas..	10 00
Miss Milligan.....	2 00	Mrs. C. R. Thomas.....	2 00
Mr. W. W. McEwen.....	5 00	Miss Emily Tilghman.....	2 00
Miss M. A. McEwen.....	5 00	Miss Rosa M. Towne.....	5 00
Miss Eliza Otto.....	2 00		
Mr. and Mrs. Wm. Cruger		Mrs. L. D. Vail.....	2 00
Pell, N. Y.....	20 00	Mrs. John K. Valentine.....	2 00
Mrs. J. C. Randall.....	5 00	Mrs. John G. Watmough....	5 00
Mrs. John Robbins.....	3 00	Mrs. Samuel Welsh.....	2 00
Mr. R. W. Ryerss.....	25 00	Miss Fannie Welsh.....	2 00
		Miss Wheeler.....	2 00
Mrs. Edward Scull.....	2 00	Mrs. R. P. White.....	5 00
Mr. David Scull.....	2 00	Mr. Thomas Earle White....	2 00
Mrs. James C. Smith.....	10 00	Miss Rebecca White.....	25 00
Mrs. Robt. W. Smith.....	5 00	Mr. Jacob Williams.....	5 00
Miss Grace A. Smith.....	2 00	Mrs. Owen J. Wister.....	5 00
Mrs. A. May Stevenson.....	2 00	"Puss in Boots," per Mrs.	
Miss Anna P. Stevenson....	2 00	Owen J. Wister.....	20 00
Miss E. W. Stevenson.....	2 00	Dr. Matthew Woods.....	2 00
Mrs. Dexter S. Stone.....	3 00	Miss Agnes Yarnall.....	2 00

AN EXTRACT FROM THE FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF MERCY OF THE "WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN
TEMPERANCE UNION," OF PENNSYLVANIA.

BY MRS. GEORGE S. LOVELL.

Since the 18th June last, a letter and package of literature have been sent to the President of each of the 1300 local unions in Pennsylvania with a request that a local superintendent be appointed. Replies have come from unions in the following counties: Adams, Allegheny, Bradford, Bucks, Berks, Chester, Clearfield, Dauphin, Forest, Huntingdon, Lehigh, Lancaster, McKean, Montgomery, Philadelphia, Potter, Somerset, Tioga, Westmoreland, Washington and Warren. Presidents of Unions in these counties have written cordially concerning the department, promising to do what they can to have it established. The following Unions have actually appointed superintendents: Somerset, Somerset Co.;

Londonderry, Chester Co.; Pleasant Unity and New Alexandria, Westmoreland Co.; New Burlington, Bradford Co.; West Middleton, Washington Co.; Norristown, Montgomery Co., and Penfield, Clearfield Co. Four counties, Potter, Adams, Westmoreland, and Huntingdon, have appointed superintendents. All of these superintendents, county and local, have had letters explaining the work of the department sent to them, as well as packages of suitable literature.

During the early part of our year of work, Miss Frances Power Cobbe wrote to your superintendent with offers of help (from a Trust-fund placed at her disposal by a generous friend), which were very gratefully accepted. Being desirous that the W. C. T. U. at large should be interested in humane work, Miss Cobbe also wrote to Miss Willard, offering her 5000 copies of her illustrated pamphlet, *Light in Dark Places*, for distribution throughout the organization. Miss Willard requested Miss Cobbe to send them to your superintendent for this purpose, which was done. All the Vice-Presidents of the National W. C. T. U. were addressed on the subject, and copies of the above-mentioned pamphlet and other literature were sent them, with a request for the names and addresses of others in their respective States to whom literature might be sent. This request has met with a cordial response from the Presidents in 28 States and territories, namely: Alabama, Colorado, New Jersey, Ohio, North Carolina, Mississippi, Eastern Washington Territory, Kansas, Alaska, Wyoming Territory, New Mexico, Iowa, Arkansas, California, New York, Connecticut, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, Maine, Indiana, West Virginia, Georgia, New Hampshire, Oregon, Vermont, Michigan, Minnesota, and the District of Columbia. Two of these, New Jersey and Kansas, have appointed State Superintendents of the Department of Mercy; a third, Ohio, will soon do so, the excellent woman who will no doubt be chosen having already done most faithful and efficient humane work in her State.

APPENDIX.

FROM THE LONDON "ZOÖPHILIST,"

OF AUGUST, 1890.

We have the following document drawn up by Dr. A. Lutaud, an eminent hospital and practicing physician of Paris, who is also editor of the *Journal de Médecine*, and who has been a careful student, on the spot, of M. Pasteur's proceedings from the commencement:—

"On the first of July, 1889, two hundred persons met together at the Mansion House, with the Lord Mayor of London in the chair, in order to pass a vote of confidence in M. Pasteur, in the name of Great Britain and Ireland. . . .

"We will not reproduce the arguments contained in the Lord Mayor's speech, by the help of which he gives a 'brevet' of efficacy to the Pasteur method. . . .

"But where the Lord Mayor made a mistake was when he affirmed that the Pasteur method leads to no cruelty towards animals, and that the rabbits inoculated with hydrophobia are always under anæsthetics. This was an error. Some of us have often witnessed M. Pasteur's experiments, not only in his anti-hydrophobic Institute, but in the different laboratories where he has worked, and we are in a position to affirm that it is only under *very exceptional circumstances* that he administers anæsthetics to the animals he is experimenting upon.

"But the most important arguments were furnished by Sir Henry Roscoe, who read a letter from M. Pasteur, who naturally eulogized the method. Sir Henry Roscoe said that the total number of persons treated at Paris was 7000, out of which there were 71 deaths. We know that M. Pasteur entered only 71 deaths in his books; but the most precise documents give us a list, not of 71, but of 160 deaths from hydrophobia in persons who have undergone the Pasteur treatment. But this number of 160 would not be very high if the 7000 persons treated had really been suffering from hydrophobia. But we are in a position to prove not only that the persons treated by M. Pasteur were not bitten by rabid dogs, but that a great number of them *were not bitten at all*.

"Drs. Lutaud and Peter have published several authenticated cases in which M. Pasteur inoculated individuals who had simply caressed or approached animals which they after-

wards thought to have been rabid. Quite recently a curious fact which happened near Nancy proves that M. Pasteur inoculates indiscriminately all the persons who come to his Institute. Here is the case:—

“On the 19th of March, 1889, we were informed by a telegram addressed to the *Petit Journal* that two persons had succumbed to hydrophobia at Jarville, a small commune of 1775 inhabitants, near Nancy. The same telegram stated that 32 other inhabitants, also bitten by a doubtful dog, had gone to place themselves under treatment at the Pasteur Institute.

“The case seeming unusual, Dr. Lutaud immediately set out for Nancy. This is what he learned from the mouth of the doctor at Jarville himself:—

“‘There has never been a case of hydrophobia in Jarville. A month ago (20th March, 1889) a woman named Bontin, who keeps a *café*, much frequented, had a young dog with very caressing habits which used to play with the customers. Feeling ill, this woman gave away her dog, which passed through many hands, and thus had many owners.

“‘In the meanwhile an inhabitant of Jarville, a customer of Madame Bontin’s *café*, died of *delirium tremens*. A short time afterwards the woman Bontin, who had a cancer in the stomach, died after extremely copious hemorrhage.

“‘These two sudden deaths vividly impressed the peasants at Jarville. Some one having pronounced the word Hydrophobia, a fearful panic spread through the village and every one fancied himself hydrophobic. On the 20th March, 1889, twenty inhabitants went to the Pasteur Institute, where they were immediately inoculated; on the 22d March twenty other inhabitants came to join the first, and were treated in the same way. Here are 40 individuals who appear amongst the statistics of 7000, and who are considered as having been cured of hydrophobia. It was, however, proved that the dog of Madame Bontin was not rabid, since it is alive at the present moment.’

“We have laid stress upon this case, because it shows better than any other that a large number of the persons considered by M. Pasteur as successfully treated by him were not affected by hydrophobia.

“Besides, how explain this increase in hydrophobia since the discovery of this celebrated anti-rabic method? In three years M. Pasteur claims to have treated and cured of hydro-

phobia 6000 French people in his laboratory. One had a right to ask whence come these hydrophobic patients? The most reliable statistics show that the number of victims of hydrophobia in France before the rise of the Pasteur treatment was from 12 to 30 per annum. To-day it would appear that we have in France 2000 cases of hydrophobia treated and cured by M. Pasteur, and this is evidently impossible.

"Let us examine the figures for France, where statistics were strictly kept before the application of the new treatment:

"The average of deaths from hydrophobia in France during the last 25 years was 30. (Statistics of Tardieu and Brouardel.)

"Let us now see the number of persons having succumbed to hydrophobia in France since the time when M. Pasteur began to inoculate his spinal cord virus:—

"In 1886	there were in France	39 deaths.
"In 1887	" " "	37 "
"In 1888	" " "	53 "

Total, . . . 129 deaths.

"The average for the three years is then 43 deaths.

"Thus we have since the use of the Pasteur method in France an increase of 13 *deaths per annum*.

"But the most recent facts demonstrate the extremely grave danger to which those rash persons are exposed who go to be treated for rabies (often imaginary) at M. Pasteur's Institute, by his inoculation.

"There exists at Turin two anti-rabic Institutes; one directed by Dr. Baratieri and the other by Dr. Bareggi.

"From the 22d to the 26th of June, 1889, five persons died from experimental hydrophobia at Turin, after being inoculated at the Institute directed by Dr. Bareggi.

"The Pasteurians, scared by this disaster, pretended that M. Bareggi deviated for some time from the practice of Pasteur to study that of Ferran. However that may be, the Italian Government was obliged to shut up the Anti-Rabic Institute of Dr. Bareggi.

"But eight days later (2d of July, 1889) the journals of Turin announced new disasters, no longer at the establishment of Bareggi, but at the Institute directed by Baratieri, the *only one* possessing the confidence of M. Pasteur. Three cases of experimental hydrophobia took place after the inoculations

practiced by Baratieri, which increases to *eight* the number of persons who died victims of this treatment.

"It is to be regretted that these deplorable facts were not communicated to the British people.

"Facts of this kind confirm the opinion expressed two years ago by Peter, Lutaud and Colin, viz., not only does *M. Pasteur not cure hydrophobia, but he gives it.*

FROM "NATURE," JULY 18TH, 1889.

Last week the Lord Mayor received a letter from M. Pasteur acknowledging the receipt of the resolutions passed at the recent Mansion House meeting. In this letter M. Pasteur writes: . . . The manifestation of July 1st had not only for its object the question of the treatment and possible extinction of hydrophobia in England, but in the nature of things it was also a protest against that false sentimentality which led certain persons not—which was already a strong point with them—merely to put on the same footing the life of men and that of animals, but even to prefer the existence of animals to the salvation of human life. When this view is taken, what is the limit? We must become firm vegetarians. We must even extend our scruples, so that no living being is sacrificed. We must endure the importunities of a mosquito, the daring of a mouse, the stings of a flea—false ideas or excuses for a tirade which one finds is most often at the bottom of all the attacks on experimental physiology. Certain credulous souls—by I know not what tales—imagine that our laboratories are chambers of torture. They ignore the fact that the rabbit or the Guinea pig is rendered insensible by chloroform before it is subjected to the most insignificant operation. As for me personally, the suffering of an animal affects me so much that I would never shoot a bird, and the cry of a wounded skylark pierces me to the heart; but if the investigation of the mysteries of nature and the acquisition of new truths be at stake, the sovereignty of the object justifies all. Who, then, having the least regard for the pursuit

of the knowledge of the mysteries of nature, would put in the balance the sacrifice of a few fowls and rabbits with the discovery of the attenuation of virus and prophylactics which have resulted from such sacrifice.

No one, my Lord Mayor, will have contributed more than you have done to rectify the errors which, under a show of compassion, can only hinder the progress of science and compromise even the most legitimate interests of humanity.

A French physician who was in London at the time wrote the following reply :

To the Editor of the Pall Mall Gazette :—

SIR:—Will you permit a vivisector, past and present, and future, if it were necessary for the good of science and mankind, to tell those good people who believe seriously that the animals experimented on by M. Pasteur do not suffer, that they are deceiving themselves; my personal experience of fifteen years' practice gives me the right formally to deny the truth of that. I have vivisected birds, horses, frogs, rabbits, monkeys, and, above all, dogs; and I can affirm three things:—

1. That it is nearly completely impossible to employ anæsthetics upon them, so as to render them insensible; as, for example, ether, chloroform, chloral, opium (morphine, codeïne), cannabis indica (hashish), etc.

2. That the sufferings of the animals are so great after the experiments, that they are altogether stupefied; the most ferocious dogs allow themselves to be used, later on, with the indifference of a sheep; one must not absolutely confound their tranquillity with the relief given to a man after a necessary surgical operation, but as the apathy and indifference of a martyr. I have experimented upon mad dogs; the second time I placed them on the table they were as gentle as rabbits. For the rest, it may be said in passing, mad dogs are already so ill that in general they are very gentle.

3. The employment of curare, far from diminishing sensibility, augments it exceedingly; more than that, the use of it necessitates tracheotomy beforehand, to make them respire artificially, because the curare totally paralyzes all voluntary movement, and thus they would otherwise suffocate.

Any one who is accustomed to a laboratory, to physiology, or to pathological experiments, knows that animals suffer when vivisected, and greatly, until death comes to deliver them. No! It is necessary for M. Pasteur to have living animals to support his thesis: this letter is not the place to inquire whether he is right or wrong; but that I maintain, I, pathologist and lately chief of a hospital, that he has imposed upon brave men whose confidence he has won, when he pretends that these animals do not suffer. To listen to him, one would say they come voluntarily to submit themselves to experiments, to procure pleasures hitherto unknown.

Yours truly,

DR. F. BOREL.

8 Soho Square, July 19th.

ROBERT BROWNING.

In Robert Browning, the Victoria Street Society has lost one of its earliest supporters and staunchest friends. From the first Memorial against Vivisection presented to the Jermyn Street Society in 1875 down to the prospectus of the Shaftesbury Hospital, sent to him a few weeks ago by Dr. Berdoo, the great poet gave his adherence, not merely with willingness, but fervor, to every appeal issued to home or foreign authorities on behalf of the tortured brutes. In his final volume of poems which has come as his last word to the world, he has not failed to express once again his scorn and detestation of vivisectionists. . . . And here is Mr. Browning's last letter on the work of our friends, the founders of the Shaftesbury Hospital:—

29 DE VERE GARDENS, August 27th, 1889.

My dear Dr. Berdoo:—I shall be delighted if the association of my name with those of the patrons of the proposed scheme for an Anti-Vivisectionist Hospital be of the least service in so holy a cause. Do permit me to take the opportunity of saying how grateful I am to you on other grounds.

Ever truly yours,

The Zoöphilist, January, 1890.

ROBERT BROWNING.

WM. F. FELL & CO. PRINTERS, 1220-24 SANSON ST., PHILADELPHIA.